

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 25 are amended and claims 3-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15-16, 19-21 and 23-24 are canceled. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-6, 17-18, 20-22 and 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,484,512) in view of Chiarelli (U.S. Patent No. 4,040,566). The Office Action also rejects claims 8-10, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki et al. in view of Chiarelli and further in view of Jacobi (U.S. Patent No. 4,326,013).

The Office Action also rejects claims 3, 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki et al. in view of Chiarelli and further in view of Narayanan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,299,744). The Office Action also rejects claims 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki et al. in view of Chiarelli and further in view of Born (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,835). Applicant traverses these rejections as they may apply to the amended claims.

The present claims are directed to a hydrogen station or a process for operating a hydrogen station and require, inter alia, "a tank for storage of the hydrogen in the dry state."

The subject matter of now-cancelled claim 3 has been added to claim 1. This subject matter relates to the regenerating apparatus 9 of the illustrated embodiment. This regenerating apparatus 9 is specifically described in the filed text at paragraphs [0019] to [0022]. Since, in the regenerating process, the regenerating hydrogen is passed by a hydrogen-circulating device through the first dewatering device, whose function has been declined with an increased in amount of moisture captured, even if,

after regeneration, such hydrogen remains in the dewatering device which has been subjected to regenerating operation, the remaining hydrogen cannot cause a problem in the subsequent water-removing operation of the dewatering device.

It is noted that the Examiner asserts that one of skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the Sasaki et al. device "because when excess hydrogen is generated storage of the excess hydrogen until needed is beneficial and would not waste a valuable commodity" (see the paragraph of the Office Action extending from page 3 to page 4).

However, the device of Sasaki et al. does not produce excess hydrogen and thus does not waste excess hydrogen. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that there would have been no need to prevent the waste of a valuable commodity.

Additionally, Chiarelli requires "[f]or added protection against accidental explosion, the...hydrogen holding [tank 146] can be constructed of non-porous pliable plastic material, and placed in a well-ventilated highly constructed shed...disposed partly below ground level" (column 7, lines 19-24). While such an apparatus may be practical for a solar energy heating system, Applicant does not believe it would be practical for the non-analogous electronics industry, for which the Sasaki et al. invention is intended.

Jacobi et al. disclose an energy system including a tank for storing gas under pressure. As discussed above, Sasaki et al. teach against the inclusion of a tank for storing gas. Thus, as Sasaki et al. do not teach or suggest the inclusion of a tank, and further teach against using a tank as disclosed in Jacobi et al. (and in Chiarelli), Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious over the combination of Sasaki et al., Chiarelli and Jacobi et al.

Narayanan et al. disclose hydrogen generation by electrolysis. Narayanan et al. do not appear to discuss storage of the hydrogen. In any case, as discussed above, Sasaki et al. teach against the inclusion of a tank for storing gas. Thus, as Sasaki et al. do not teach or suggest the inclusion of a tank, and further teach against using a tank as disclosed in Chiarelli, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious over the combination of Sasaki et al., Chiarelli and Narayanan et al.

Born disclose a weather forecasting watch. Born does not appear to teach or suggest the storage of hydrogen in a tank, as required by the present claims. Additionally, as discussed above, Sasaki et al. teach against the inclusion of a tank for storing gas. Thus, as Sasaki et al. do not teach or suggest the inclusion of a tank, and further teach against using a tank as disclosed in Chiarelli, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious over the combination of Sasaki et al., Chiarelli and Born.

For at least the above reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should this paper not be considered timely filed, Applicant petitions for an extension of time as may be appropriate. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number 107348-00170.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert K. Carpenter", written over a horizontal line.

Robert K. Carpenter  
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372  
ARENT FOX PLLC  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339  
Tel: (202) 857-6000  
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd